

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 6, 2002

LB 407

amendments. The committee statement found on your computers has a breakdown of the bill's sections after the above bills were amended onto LB 407, if you want to look at the changes made to a specific plan. As I mentioned before, they were all...each of these bills was independently advanced unanimously by the committee and then independently added into the committee amendment here. The fiscal impact of the bill is minimal considering the size of the plans. According to the fiscal notes, the impact is \$218,000 and it's attributed to the provision in LB 407 that requires mandatory membership in the state plan after 12 months of continuous service for full-time employees. It's an estimate. There's no way to know the ages, salaries, and so on, so we won't have an A bill. With that, I would ask that the full Legislature advance the amendments to the bill. Thank you.

SENATOR JANSSEN PRESIDING

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Bruning. You've heard the opening on the committee amendments. There is an amendment to the committee amendments. Senator Wickersham. (AM3020, Legislative Journal pages 839-840.)

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Mr. President, members of the body, the amendment to the amendment concerns an issue for the judges retirement plan. And...and what it does is, I think, bring into...into focus the true assets of the plan for purposes of the annual actuarial valuations. Part of the contribution to the judges plan is a fee that is paid in every court case. And if you've ever seen a receipt for fees that you file...or fees that you pay in a court filing, there is a little box on there and it says judges retirement dollar. That money, however, is not fully accounted for in the actuarial valuation of the judges retirement system, because it's not statutorily required that that contribution be made to that plan and, because it isn't, then the actuary doesn't count it as an asset for the actuarial valuation. Now, it's always gone there, and I can't imagine it would go anyplace else, so the amendment that I'm offering simply says that the employer contribu...to the fund, and that's talking about the judges retirement fund, shall include the amount remitted under 24-703, which is the judges retirement